

January 7th, 2013 (#1243)
Alan Watt "Cutting Through The Matrix" LIVE on RBN:

Poem Copyright Alan Watt Jan. 7th, 2013:

The Squeaky Wheel:

**"A Powerful Lobby Group Always Knows
Political Decisions Follow Money Flows,
Democracy, a System for Powerful Minorities
To Direct Policy Over Silent Majorities,
From Treaties to Such "Special Relationships",
Powerful Nations Used, "Tied at the Hips",
To Fight Others' Wars Leaving Nation Confused
And Puzzled Over Why They're Being Used,
Yes the Most Powerful Lobby Wins with Ease,
Because The Squeaky Wheel Gets the Grease"
© Alan Watt January 7th, 2013**

Poem & Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - Jan. 7th, 2013 (Exempting Music, Literary
Quotes, and Callers' Comments)

cuttingthroughthematrix.com

alternate sites:

cuttingthroughthematrix.net , [.us](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.us) , [.ca](http://cuttingthroughthematrix.ca)

alanwattcuttingthroughthematrix.ca

European site includes all audios & downloadable TRANSCRIPTS in European
languages for print up:

alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

mirror site:

cuttingthrough.jenknness.com

Information for purchasing Alan's books, CDs, DVDs and DONATIONS:

Canada and America: PayPal, Cash, personal checks &
for the US, **INTERNATIONAL** postal money orders / for Canada, INTERNAL postal
money orders
(America: Postal Money orders - Stress the **INTERNATIONAL** pink one, not the green
internal one.)

Outside the Americas: PayPal, Cash, Western Union and Money Gram
(Money Gram is cheaper; even cheaper is a Money Gram check - in Canadian dollars:
mail via the postal services worldwide.)

PayPal Orders: USE THE [DONATE](#) BUTTON ON THE WEBSITE - AND -
Send a separate email along with the donation (list your order, name and address)

Click the link below for your location (ordering info):

[USA](#)

[Canada](#)

[Europe/Scandinavian](#)

[All Other Countries](#)

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt, and this is Cutting Through the Matrix on the 7th of January, 2013. Newcomers, please help yourself to the website, cuttingthroughthematrix.com; you'll see the other sites listed there, the official sites I have, and these all carry free downloads for audio. They all carry transcripts as well in English for print-up. And if you go into alanwattsentientsentinel.eu you can get print-ups in other languages.

Remember too that you are the audience that bring me to you. I don't bring on advertisers as guests, and I don't get paid from any other source. I rely upon the people who listen to me to buy the books and discs at cuttingthroughthematrix.com and donate if possible as well. So, from the U.S. to Canada, remember, you can still use Personal Checks, you can use International Postal Money Orders, you can use PayPal, you can send Cash. Across the world: Western Union, Money Gram and PayPal. Remember, straight donations are really, really welcome in these inflationary times, so to speak.

And what I do, as I say, if you go into the website you'll see I go through the history (the open history at least) of the group that came out in the late 1800's and early 1900's using the British Empire as their model for a world governmental system. And it wasn't to be a hands-across-the-sea happy families and all that, it was to be a new kind of world they were going to bring in where the intelligentsia that decided that they were the intelligentsia (those who ruled the international financial lending systems based in London at that time and New York) would basically run the world and own all of the resources: that's food, water, everything that you use in commerce and production and also human resources, and use academia, get them on board to train the public in the proper way, you see, to obey government (keep them pretty dumb and stupid, in other words) and they'd have this happy-happy world to look after while they had the least problems from rebellions and so on as they went forward in this new brave new world system. Lots of big plans, we've actually lived through quite a lot of them. They even talked about bringing on world wars to help it get through, because through wars you change the cultures on all conflicting sides (it doesn't matter what side you're on, your culture is changed) and then out comes the treaties and then in comes extra forces that are given permission to alter the cultures that were competing with each other. That already happened in the States when groups were given the right to alter the American culture, and the British culture, for instance, that all flooded out of Germany prior to World War II.

So we're living through the aftermath of a lot of this; we're still going through some of it. And it's an old, old plan, as I say, because even before this group came out, the Royal Institute of International Affairs/Council on Foreign Relations/the Milner Group/etcetera, they had already been working under different names before through the centuries to make it all happen (and they've pretty well got what they wanted). They have to have a uniform media that parrots all the same stuff. You have to have a unified educational system (that's been done) across the world so that everyone gets taught the same fake reality and the same indoctrination —so important. So we've lived through quite a lot of that. And plus too, since the 1970 report came out by the Club of Rome, they'd make us into a post-consumerist society, post-democratic as well. That's been done under anti-terrorism laws and also under the bank crashes that were planned, of course, by the big plunderers that are all part of this big system.

So, they've achieved a lot of their goals and we're simply living through them and paying the cost of them, and most folk still haven't caught on to what's actually going on in reality.

So, help yourself to the website, as I say. You'll get a lot of information there to start to make you understand, at least, why it's happening. They used to say that, you know, the truth will set you free, and it's not really true at all: you might have a free mind afterwards, you'll understand everything that's going on, why it's going on, but it doesn't change the system; that's what you have to do, if you want to that is. Most folk quite like the system because they've been socialized and domesticated.

Back with more after this...

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt; we're Cutting Through the Matrix, talking about the big system we're born into. We take it for granted because your parents don't know to tell you that it's all fake and it's actually an agenda (you're living through a script) and therefore you never question it, most folk never question it. Children, very young children, can question it a little bit; they'll ask awkward questions to their parents who generally can't answer them. They'll try to in school, but eventually the school drums out the questioning from them because they don't want you to know what's going on. In fact, to be a perfectly indoctrinated person according to Jacques Ellul, a philosopher, he said that it's essential you get your primary education. Without that primary education subsequent indoctrination will not take, in other words in propaganda; it won't work on you. So that primary indoctrination is scientifically worked out so that you will not question things to any real depth again.

So, we're really in a scientifically controlled society. It used to simply be behaviorists, because behavioral psychology can be proven, as opposed to a lot of the Freudian nonsense that they put out there (the Freudian nonsense was for a different purpose and for a different reason actually). But behaviorism can be proved by empirical experiments where anyone can test the same kind of experiments doing the same formula on people who are unsuspecting and they'll behave in the same way that you expect. So, behaviorism certainly works. And of course neuroscience is in on it too today with neurolinguistics and so on. Terminology is very, very important to brainwashing, and of course so is the way that any topic is presented to the people, especially in education or through the general media in the documentaries that you watch. You can completely mislead people by giving them only part of a story, and that's the usual trick that's used, not all the rest of the story to let you make up your own mind.

But, remember, getting back to the Royal Institute of International Affairs, which was the coalition of different groups based in Britain that were speciality groups (the Milner Group was taking over the world's resources, for instance). And most of these guys who ran and set up the Royal Institute of International Affairs came into Britain from other countries and they were top money-lenders and money-lending families (the Curtis families and different ones) and they had a different agenda for the world. They'd use Britain, as I say, as the embryo to start up world government using the old empire, and then American was to take over the responsibility. And that was done in the times, really, of Kipling (Kipling talked quite a lot about it). He was upset because he thought that Britain would hold on to the main power of what was to happen across the world, however he accepted gracefully that they'd have to hand it over to the US and he even wrote a poem about it too.

Anyway, the banking boys, the banking fraternity, at the end - which controls it all anyway: they control the military-industrial complex, they control countries through their lending to countries; they can crash countries overnight if they want to - they're the big boys. I'm talking about the biggest banks, of course, and they'd run our lives.

Now, Carroll Quigley who was the historian for the Council on Foreign Relations (which is the other name used outside Britain for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, and they run in every country too), he goes through in "The Anglo-American Establishment" quite a lot of their history. He actually mentions the fact that they're behind most of the wars (he was quite proud of it in fact). He thought this big goal was worthy of any means possible to make it happen. But he goes through the fact that eventually the central banks will come under an umbrella with the International Monetary Fund, all set up by the same group (The Council on Foreign Relations/Royal Institute of International Affairs), and they'll go under the Bank for International Settlements in Basel Switzerland, you see, to run the world. Now, none of us have any

say in the matter. They just create their own clubs (like even the G20 is a club that we didn't vote for, or were even asked about, in fact) and of course they all work for the big bankers at the top. Well, talking about the Bank for International Settlements, it says here the...

European bank shares have risen following the weekend agreement on the minimum amounts of cash and easy-to-sell assets that banks have to hold.

(Alan: Because they had a meeting, you see, in Basel. It ties right in with what Quigley said in "The Anglo-American Establishment," as they raise themselves up to a power institution that is now involved in politics and social agendas. So, it said that...)

A previous draft two years ago said they would have to meet new requirements by 2015,

(A: That's all banks...)

but that has now been extended to 2019.

The reserves are supposed to make banks less vulnerable to lots of customers trying to withdraw their money.

It is the first time there have been liquidity rules covering global banks.

The agreement was made by the group of banking regulators that oversees the Basel Committee

(A: See, Basel, again...)

on Banking Supervision.

Analysts say the rules just announced are more flexible than a draft version, and shares in banks rose on Monday morning.

Barclays shares rose 3.8%....

(A: And it gives you a list of who rose up and so on. And it says here that...)

Under the new rules, banks will have to hold enough cash and easy-to-sell assets to tide them over during a 30-day crisis.

In the lead up to the financial crisis, banks ran down these reserves to dangerously low levels.

(A: The last time.)

Regulators hope that extra liquidity would allow banks to survive a run on them, as happened with Northern Rock in 2007.

"If you want your money back immediately and there is a queue round the block, hopefully the bank would be able to meet those demands," explained Brian Caplen, editor of The Banker.

"That should restore confidence in the bank and then it can restructure itself in order to get out of trouble, but it doesn't make banking entirely safe."

(A: Well, it doesn't do anything except protect the bankers is what it does because they don't have to hold all the assets and liquidity to cover all the loans they have outstanding or the deposits they have in their banks. It says...)

"If a bank had made lots of bad loans to the wrong kind people and was unable to collect that money, a bank will still get into trouble."

But Mr Caplen pointed out that liquidity was not a problem for major UK banks at the moment.

(A: He says...)

"We are making rules for the next generation. A crisis of the enormity of the 2007 banking crisis... only comes along once in a lifetime, I think," he told BBC News.

(A: Well he knows perfectly well that they plunder the planet at least twice a century, sometimes three.)

By 2019, banks will be required to hold cash and assets - which can quickly be sold - equivalent to the amount they think could leave the bank in during a 30-day high stress period, net of the amount coming in.

In 2015, banks will have to hold assets worth 60% of these anticipated net cash outflows.

(A: So I guess 40% ain't going to get anything, you see. And then it says here...)

One big change in the rules has been which assets count as easy to sell.

(A: And that's when you get into the cons, you see. And it says...)

Some company shares, corporate bonds and residential mortgages have been added to the list, which previously only included assets such as government bonds.

"The inclusion of mortgage-backed securities will be seen by some as odd, since these proved to be wholly illiquid and unsellable in the summer of 2007," said BBC business editor Robert Peston.

(A: Now the fact is, what they're not mentioning in this article here, is that the banks plundered the public fraudulently (it was all fraud, it was criminally fraud) because they knew that the mortgages weren't worth a fraction of what they were selling them for. And banks were passing them to banks, selling them off with higher value added and higher value added with each sale, and that's what really caused the whole bubble in the first place and it bust. But it's not mentioned here at all. It's amazing how they...and they'll know most of the public have already forgotten why it all happened anyway. Anyway...)

Banks had warned that over-stringent standards could reduce lending and

stifle economic growth, because they would be forced to hang onto funds rather than lend them out.

Bank of England governor Sir Mervyn King, who also chairs the group of regulators from 27 countries that agreed the deal, said that the phased introduction would mean the new standards would not "hinder the ability of the global banking system to finance a recovery".

Analysts welcomed the greater-than-expected relaxation of the rules.

A: So, it's just better for the banks in actual fact. And it's almost a go-ahead for them to plunder us all again, which they'll do anyway, without permission. That's how you get folk into austerity, you understand; that's part of the big plan. And they've lost nothing, because the public bailed them all out, you see. Each time they do it, we bail them out, they lose nothing at all.

And then, another article on it too. And it says...

International banking regulators agreed Sunday on global rules meant to ensure banks keep enough cash in hand to survive future market crises, and gave banks until 2019 to comply fully.

The rules will require banks in future to hold enough cash, and assets such as equities, corporate and government bonds that can easily be sold, to tide them over during an acute 30-day crisis.

The body that oversees the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, which sets international rules, said Sunday....

(A: So, there again. Now who gave them permission to set international rules? Do you see how it's all done quietly, and just stated like fact? and you accept it as fact, like it's gravity, it's always been there. And then it says that...)

The oversight body's head, Bank of England governor Mervyn King, said after regulators met in Basel, Switzerland, that the timeframe ensures the new standards "will in no way hinder the ability of the global banking system to finance the recovery."

The hope is that it will prevent lenders from becoming over-reliant in future on help from central banks, which have stepped in over recent years to keep the financial system flush with cash.

A: And so it's all a joke as I say; it's all a joke. Money is a joke anyway (it really is a joke), complete joke, based on nothing at all. There's no backup saying, ok, here's a pound of this in weight for so much of this; it's all done on faith now, you see. And faith comes and goes, it wanes quite often and things go bust. But this is the joke that they call reality for the public, who never ask any questions.

Tonight too I'll put up a couple of links on a couple of ads that are out there, advertisements to do with brain-chipping, really, in the ads, and cyborg (turning the people who use these apps on their phones into a cyborg, like a kind of joke thing). But again, it's pushing the envelope for the youngsters, you know, that are the little muppeteers out there that will soak this stuff up and think it's just wonderful. And it's a

Verizon commercial...

Verizon Commercial - Droid DNA "Extra Sensory"

A: It says. I'll put that up for those who want to have a little chuckle at how they brainwash the up-and-coming young group. But there are two of these ads, actually, and you can see what they do.

Now, the Council on Foreign Relations is quite interesting because that's the main group that was set up by the Royal Institute of International Affairs to run all journalism and all newspapers across the world (all magazines, etcetera etcetera) and to standardize all misinformation, which they give out to us, you see. But this one goes on about the latest Post of Obama, Mr. Hagel, and the group that are opposing him. I don't see how they can oppose him, but they can, because they've got power.

Back with more after this break...

Hi folks, I'm back; we're Cutting Through the Matrix, talking about the Council on Foreign Relations and an article on Chuck Hagel and his nomination to be Secretary of Defense. And, now the CFR (Council on Foreign Relations), as I say, is meant to standardize all news. All news knows to look to them and their websites and all their specialists, you see, for news articles and that's the way you have to write them, that way it's written in the CFR. They also have their members, journalists, embedded in all newspapers across the planet. So, it's the biggest disinformation group pushing this whole world agenda; it's a vital part of it. As I say, the CFR has got different functions, but their main one is also to give out the thoughts to all the public, all the politicians, they advise governments across the planet, and they have their own particular agenda at work (I'll put it that way). Anyway it says here... this is how they start off this article, by Eliot Abrams (who is not disinterested in this article). It says...

During the hearings on Chuck Hagel's nomination to be secretary of defense, it's clear that the views of gay rights

(A: Now, it's got a different title at the top. It actually calls, in the CFR, this article "Mr. Hagel and the Jews," right. But they start it off with another taboo thing, you see...)

During the hearings on Chuck Hagel's nomination to be secretary of defense, it's clear that the views of gay rights organizations will be heard. There the issue seems to be whether Hagel's apology for previous remarks and beliefs was sincere, or motivated solely by self-interest. He had years to apologize publicly, but did so only when opposition from gay rights groups threatened his nomination.

(A: So there's the first defamation there, you see.)

But in the case of allegations of anti-Semitism, Hagel has not even apologized. He has remained silent, though one can expect the usual "perhaps I didn't word that sentence as best I might have" excuse to emerge at his hearings. The question is, what might he have to apologize for? Why would anyone think he was an anti-Semite?

Here the testimony of the Jewish community that knew him best is most useful: Nebraskans. And the record seems unchallenged: Nebraskan Jewish activists and officials have said he was hostile, and none—including Obama

supporters and Democratic party activists—have come forward to counter that allegation.

(A: Well, hostile to what? It says...)

The flavor of the accounts is given in a headline in one Jewish website: "Nebraska Jews Recall Senator Chuck Hagel as 'Unfriendly' and 'Unmovable' on Israel, 'Didn't Give a Damn About the Jewish Community.'"

(A: So being an anti-Semite is being an American and any other country comes secondly, I guess.)

The former editor of the Omaha Jewish Press recalled that "Hagel was the only one we have had in Nebraska, who basically showed the Jewish community that he didn't give a damn about the Jewish community or any of our concerns." Another community leader commented that "During his last year in office, we knew he was not going to run again, he never returned any of our calls."

Hagel seems to have a thing about "the Jews," as the story of the USO in Haifa also shows. During the 1980s, U.S. Navy ships began to dock in Haifa, ultimately reaching 40 to 50 ships and 45,000 sailors a year visiting there. The Sixth Fleet asked for a USO facility and got one in 1984, and when ships were in port 400-500 sailors a day would visit the USO there. When USO budget problems risked the closure of the facility, the Sixth Fleet fought back and kept it open—until ship visits declined sharply in the 1990s and the facility was shuttered.

Haifa was in many ways an ideal port for U.S. Navy visitors, as a 1986 USO newsletter reflected:

(A: And it says here, from the USO newsletter...)

Commander Edward Simmons of the [USS] Eisenhower attributes "the remarkable absence of incidents" to "the response of the people here in Haifa. It's so sincere. Everything has been superb...."

(A: It was just like a PR thing, like a holiday thing almost you'd think. This is for a Naval Base; this is for a Naval Base, so I'll skip this. It says...)

The Israeli who headed the USO site, Gila Gerson, was later given a prize by the U.S. Navy for her work. There seems little doubt that USO Haifa was immensely successful and valued.

It's in that context that Hagel's 1989 effort to shut it down, and his comments when doing so, become problematic. A meeting with officials of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), which sought to keep USO Haifa open, was described by Marsha Haltzman of JINSA to the Washington Free Beacon.

"He said to me, 'Let the Jews pay for it.' He essentially told us that if we wanted to keep the USO [in Haifa] open—and when I say 'we,' he meant 'the

Jews'—he said the Jews could pay for it.

(A: Maybe he was meaning the Israelis.)

I told him at the time that I found his comments to be anti-Semitic."

(A: See, you can't get into any argument with these folk without getting slandered because the US has been trying to cut back certain bases they haven't been using for years. It says...)

That's precisely what the Senate Armed Services Committee should be wondering, too. They ought to call as witnesses some of the Nebraska Jewish leaders who recall Hagel as a man hostile to their community and ask why they formed that conclusion. They ought to call those who attended the USO meeting where Hagel said, "Let the Jews pay for it," and ask about his demeanor at that session. That the USO had budget problems is clear, but what other locations did Hagel seek to close? Did he ever suggest that the Japanese or Germans or Emiratis or Italians pay for a USO site? Did he ever suggest that Italian-Americans or Japanese-Americans pay for USO facilities overseas? Did he ever try, in good faith and without bigotry,

(A: But did he do any bigotry?)

to work with the American Jewish community and the government of Israel to see if, in fact, additional private support could be found for the immensely popular Haifa site—or did he just say, "Let the Jews pay for it," with the hostility recalled by Nebraskan Jews?

Perhaps there are answers, and perhaps Mr. Hagel actually has no problem with "the Jews." But one purpose of confirmation hearings should be to find out.

A: So, you understand, America is very compromised; it's either American or it's not. If it's American then it's Americans' affairs first. It should be their own affairs, that's it, first, first and foremost, instead of always going up to enquiries over people who really have another country outside America that they give all their allegiance to.

Back with more after this break...

Hi folks, I'm back; we're Cutting Through the Matrix. And, an article on Chuck Hagel as well from the BBC (which is not impartial either if you see who staffs it, a lot of it too), it says...

The president said Mr Hagel knew that American leadership was "indispensable", but added that he would treat military action as a last resort.

US President Barack Obama has named Chuck Hagel to be his next defense secretary and counter-terrorism adviser John Brennan to lead the CIA, but the nominations may not go smoothly.

(A: And so it says...)

Former Nebraska Senator Hagel's fellow Republicans have accused him of being hostile to Israel and soft on Iran.

(A: And we know who the Republicans are that say it, it's the neoconservatives.)

Mr Brennan is also under scrutiny over harsh interrogation techniques used at the CIA.

Both appointments must be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr Obama, who has just returned from a family holiday in Hawaii, said at a White House press conference that Mr Hagel was "the leader our troops deserve".

(A: And they go on in the BBC to say this is the...)

'Worst possible message'

(A: So they're really against him too, so they've got a stake in this.)

Mr Obama said that Mr Hagel, 66, has been a "champion of our troops", as he praised his independence and bipartisan approach.

(A: And then to find out what their beef is too, it says...)

The president said Mr Hagel knew that American leadership was "indispensable", but added that he would treat military action as a last resort.

Mr Obama said: "Most importantly, Chuck knows that war is not an abstraction."

Mr Hagel, a decorated Vietnam War veteran, would be the first enlisted soldier to lead the Pentagon.

In his remarks, Mr Hagel said he would try to "live up to the standards" of his predecessors, as he pledged to strengthen America's alliances.

Meanwhile, Mr Brennan said he would work to ensure that the CIA "always reflects the liberties, freedoms and values that we hold so dear".

(A: And I think they should say about the CIA, they should define who they are and who "we" hold so dear happen to be too because they were compromised in the beginning.)

Along with Senator John Kerry, whom Mr Obama nominated last month to replace Hillary Clinton as secretary of state, Mr Hagel and Mr Brennan would help shape the president's second-term national security agenda.

(A: Now it says...)

But the choice of Mr Hagel could prompt a Senate confirmation battle.

Mr Hagel has stoked controversy in criticising a military strike by either the US or Israel against Iran.

(A: So there's your first part of it here.)

He has also advocated including Iran on future peace talks in Afghanistan.

Although no Republican lawmakers are threatening to block Mr Hagel's nomination, influential senators have attacked him.

Senator John McCain said he had "serious concerns" over the Nebraskan's positions on a "range of critical national security issues", which he would raise during the Senate confirmation process.

Mr Hagel made critical remarks against the Israel lobby in the US capital, in a 2008 book by former state department official Aaron David Miller.

(A: It says...)

"The Jewish lobby intimidates a lot of people up here," Mr Hagel was quoted as saying. "I'm a United States senator. I'm not an Israeli senator."

(A: So he's saying what is, right?)

Top Republican Senator Lindsey Graham told CNN on Sunday: "This is an in-your-face nomination of the president to all of us who are supportive of Israel."

A: And then it goes in about homophobia and all the usual stuff too as they try and defame him altogether, you see. And that's what they do, is smear campaigns in order to get this guy not eventually put into this position, obviously —pretty standard stuff.

And also tonight too I'll put up this article, and it's from The Hill. And it says...

Heitkamp: Reported Obama gun-control proposals 'extreme'

A: And they go through in this article the fact that they won't get what they're after, so they'll probably go after the psychological testing idea which is just as dangerous, actually, because they actually want everyone in the country to get psychologically tested down the road (the United Nations wants that too, so did the Frankfurt school and that's been in the works ever since they were in business and the guys that took over from them), and that will go into all kinds of directions, not just for getting guns and so on, once they start this testing. Understand that psychology and psychiatry were created as socio-political tools for a particular group: they are tools of a political agenda. And they were set up as such, in fact, to completely alter society, destroy the dominant cultures of Western countries so that those who were pushing it could become the dominant minority themselves (and it's pretty well happened). And once they get into, like Scotland, for instance: they've already got Scotland under this totalitarian system of testing all school children and trying to even find if they've got bad genes and all this kind of stuff. That all came from the Frankfurt School, and you better understand what that was (and still is) because it simply blossomed into a whole bunch of other organizations —this is how they do it when it becomes too obvious who they are. So I'll put up this article here that they'll end up doing that, psychological testing

and so on. Any family history of it, any pills you've been on in the past (anything at all) and you won't get a firearm and you might not even get a car to drive in; it will have a lot of ramifications, you know, if this goes ahead.

Also from, again, the Council on Foreign Relations (this big private organization that advises all governments and even puts in your presidents and prime ministers, and that's according to Carroll Quigley, again, who was their official historian for years: he said they give you your presidents and prime ministers, have since the late 1800's he says in his own books —he was the official historian for the group); it says...

U.S. Gun Policy: Global Comparisons

A: And it gives you global comparisons. Well, what's comparisons got to do... they always use the comparison thing when they have nothing else to fall back on. I mean, if they were beheading people in China should we behead them here? You see; so it's all nonsense. You can't use comparisons at all. And if the whole world was under totalitarianism and had all the firearms confiscated, so you should do the same thing, and go into the same system? No, it just doesn't make any sense; these are ridiculous arguments: they're not arguments at all.

Now, getting back to Scotland, how they're way ahead of most countries because they're run, again, by people who have a special interest in this world governmental system. It says...

Every Scottish teacher and pupil will have to adopt a "greener" approach and show a commitment to social justice, if an ambitious new report commissioned by the Scottish government is adopted.

(A: This is a big trial for a lot of European countries. It's called...)

Learning for Sustainability, the report of the One Planet Schools Working Group, originated in a Scottish National Party commitment in its 2010 election manifesto to develop the concept of "one planet schools".

The report calls for all schools to embrace "one planet living" as part of a step change to making Scotland one of the first sustainable, low-carbon industrialised nations on Earth.

(A: Well it will be because there's only about five million Scots left, you know. It's one of the smallest minorities on the planet. But it's a good test bed to test them out as they're all dying off, as they said they'd kill them off a long time ago too —even John Stuart Mill had them listed for that, so did HG Wells, for extermination because they wouldn't buckle under to tyranny, you know. And they never change their goals, remember. But it says here that...)

"one planet living" as part of a step change to making Scotland one of the first sustainable, low-carbon industrialized nations on Earth.

(A: Now what they're talking about here is total communist indoctrination (that's what they're talking about here) and communal living and everything else. It says...)

The group, which was chaired by Professor Peter Higgins - a specialist in outdoor and environmental education at the University of Edinburgh's Moray House School of Education - starts from the premise that "humanity is

currently using 50 per cent more resources than the planet can sustain”.

(A: The usual rubbish, you see.)

It defines “one planet living” as “ensuring that we only use resources at a rate that can be replenished and in a manner that is equitable within, and between, nations and generations”.

To achieve this, the authors of the report want to see the creation of “a Scotland where learners are educated

(A: This is indoctrinated...)

through their landscape and understand their environment, culture and heritage;

(A: Well, you see, they’re under the E.U. parliament; the E.U. parliament is trying to eradicate your culture and your heritage and your history (they’ve said that openly) and bring in a European history and culture, whatever that might be. And apart from that, they’ve already eradicated most of Scotland’s culture and heritage anyway. And it says...)

where they develop a sense of place and belonging to their local, national and global community....

(A: So there you are. How can you belong to your local, national, and global community when you live in utter poverty and degradation? And that’s been the agenda for years in Scotland, to bring them down, close off all manufacturing, even stop the fishing communities and everything else, and put them all on the dole and bring in the heroin. That’s how you destroy cultures, folks; and it’s been awfully successful but they’re not stopped with it yet. They’ll just use them as an experiment as they go down and evaporate, and meanwhile indoctrinate them, seeing if little children will grow up parroting all the little red book stuff or the green book (same bunch actually). Green is the sacred color of socialism or communism. Did you know that? So...)

All the new National qualifications should be developed to reflect this agenda, they recommend, and Education Scotland should develop a national strategy and evaluate the schools’ delivery. The Scottish Futures Trust should also make compliance a condition of funding for new school buildings, they add.

(A: So, you must indoctrinate them in this system, not to learn to work or to find work or even create work because they don’t want that in Scotland, you see. And...)

The report rolls up three familiar elements - sustainable development education, global citizenship and outdoor learning - into a single, new title: learning for sustainability. And it makes clear that the concept goes beyond “green issues” to include social and economic issues, too.

A: Well exactly, because you see the whole green agenda, again just like the whole Freudian concept, is for social and political purposes, folks, and not for the good of the people, believe you me. It’s disgusting. Total indoctrination in a country that’s a mess now by design; it’s a mess by design. It wasn’t when I was growing up, but they’ve

made it so.

And also...

Obama administration allowed to remain silent over drone programme

(A: It says.)

The Obama administration does not have to disclose the legal basis for its drone targeted killing programme of Americans....

(A: So there you go, there's your diktat from the boys at the top, you see. That's what they used to get in the Soviet system, diktats from the top. "We don't have to do that; we don't have to explain anything to you.")

US District Court Judge Colleen McMahon of New York, ruling in lawsuits brought by the American Civil Liberties Union and The New York Times, said she was caught in a "paradoxical situation" (.pdf) of allowing the administration to claim it was legal to kill enemies outside traditional combat zones while keeping the legal rationale secret.

(A: So they can kill anybody they want and simply keep it secret.)

The opinion comes months after 26 members of Congress asked Obama, in a letter, to consider the consequences of drone killing and to explain the necessity of the programme. The use of drones to shoot missiles from afar at vehicles and buildings that the nation's intelligence agencies believe are being used by suspected terrorists began under the George W. Bush administration and was widened by the Obama administration to allow the targeting of American citizens. Drone strikes by the Pentagon and the CIA have sparked backlashes from foreign governments and populations, as the strikes often kill civilians, including women and children.

In the end, however, the government's claim of national security trumped the Freedom of Information Act. According to Judge McMahon....

A: So, anybody can get knocked off these days, folks, and it's all quite legal. That's it; that's their new law, you see.

Now, as they bring down the populations they still want to bring down other populations too. Remember, I've gone through the articles set out by Kissinger when he was up there running Nixon at the time (he was the boss as far as I'm concerned; even growing up I knew he was the boss). Everybody, all the foreign newspapers didn't want to talk to Nixon, they wanted to talk to Kissinger. They all knew that he was the boss. And he belongs to all the right groups, like Bilderbergers, Council on Foreign Relations (the whole lot of them), the Trilateral Commission. Anyway, he talks about bringing down the populations especially starting with the third world countries. They were already doing it at home, by the way (that's why most folk are going sterile), but they didn't tell the public that and they won't even yet admit to it, even though all the evidence is there they will not admit to it, but they've been doing it through inoculations and sterilizations.

Elite-Backed Sterilization "Safaris" Meet With Growing Resistance

(A: It says.)

The Telegraph out of Calcutta India reports that resistance grows in India's rural areas to a government scheme deploying sterilization vans.

(A: Now we've already got euthanasia vans in Holland and other countries now coming out; Britain is pushing for it big time, and through the hospitals too—they just bump you off, it's cheaper than treating you, even if you've paid into it, which they have, through all your taxes all your life. And they're bringing out sterilization vans now. It says...)

Deputy director of India's Health Department's family planning division Subodh Jaiswal said that women in rural Bihar "are very conservative and it is difficult to convince them to take part in a sterilisation programme."

(A: Well you're darn right.)

The article mentions that the department launched a mobile sterilization van "to promote sterilisation for women in Patna district." Jaiswal stated that "only 200 women have been sterilised through this project."

"Bihar", the article goes on to say, "needs rigorous family planning measures to check the unbridled growth of the population."

"...women in rural parts of the state are very conservative."

"The van has two nurses who administer the process. They try to convince women who have at least one child to opt for the sterilisation."

(A: So it's like China's policy; they give you one child and then they sterilize you. Understand now the up-and-coming countries that go into the IMF and get all the loans given to them, and all our loans too from our countries—actually we give them grants, not loans, under the World Trade Organization; we're still giving them to China! Can you believe that? This is the Free Trade deals set up by the Royal Institute of International Affairs. But along with all this cash coming in, the shucksters at the top (the hucksters as well), they all get the cash and of course they have no affiliation with the people below them so they'll take the cash and sterilize whoever they want. And lots of cash is flowing into their pockets. But the people at the bottom, you know, the trash people, you know the people at the bottom that Kissinger talked about in the third world, they have to get sterilized.)

According to the officials, the mobile sterilization van was part of a government scheme attempting to "motivate female sterilization". They admitted that the project has failed miserably because of "conservative" sentiments among women.

"There has been a sharp decline in the number of people who availed of the scheme in the last fiscal.", they told the Telegraph.

"In 2010-2011, 10,367 women had availed of the benefits of the Adarsh Dampati Yojana; in 2011-2012, only 7,700 women took advantage of the service," Jaiswal stated.

(A: Now remember too, I read articles here last year to do with the fact that they were sterilizing the people there and telling them they were doing a different kind of operation altogether. Remember that? That's how they deal with the people.)

These numbers prove that these sterilization vans are meeting with resistance from women in rural areas.

The use of such mobile sterilization units is not the invention of overzealous health officials in India. It has been developed by

(A: Guess who.)

World Bank- and UN personnel worrying about population growth in developing (and developed) nations.

(A: So, there's your big World Bank that you don't vote for (nobody did); it was set up by the big bunch that set up the United Nations, remember, at the same time. It's still a private bank, mind you, although we all give money to it—it's a private bank. So the bankers really want you all sterilized, the big ones at the top, the guys who own the world. They literally believe that; they talk about it. So anyway, it says...)

As early as the 1980s, the World Bank suggests using "sterilization vans" and "camps" to facilitate its sterilization policies for the third world. The 1984 World Development Report also threatens nations who are slow in implementing the bank's population policies with "drastic steps, less compatible with individual choice and freedom."

A: So there it goes: money is the key power to everything. And that's what Quigley said too, about the Bank for International Settlements, the World Bank and the IMF (all owned by a very elite few).

Now the music is coming in, I'll be back with more after this break...

Hi folks, we're back Cutting Through the Matrix. And, people really don't know about their history. They don't know what happened during World War II, the big plans that were drawn up for a postindustrial world. It was the same old plan that they drew up after World War I in fact, only they put more into it to make it happen. And part of it was called "National Deconstruction." What they mean by that is that they decided to destroy the dominant cultures in each country by forced migration (and they've done a successful job across the European countries) and the opening up of a welfare state to entice them to come into the countries. Britain for forty years has been advertising it's the best place to come for welfare. Now the thing is, when you have all the folk living there suddenly paying for lots and lots of people who come in to go on welfare, etcetera, the cost of living goes sky high (and taxes go up sky high too) and it only benefits the bankers that run the country now, openly. But it's happening across the whole of Europe. And it says...

Migrants strangle France alive

It seems that migration policies of a leading country in Europe, France, are seriously changing. The country is no longer able to hold back the crowd of migrants, many of whom do not want to integrate into the social and

economic life of their new home country. The upcoming radical changes for migrants were announced by French Interior Minister Manuel Valls.

After a meeting on the National Immigration and Integration, French Interior Minister Manuel Valls announced significant changes in the country's migration policy. The government will reduce financial assistance to immigrants, and this reduction will be substantial. Starting March 1 of next year, French immigrant benefits will be reduced by 83 percent.

(A: Which is almost the amount of taxation they're talking about putting on everybody in France. See, Gérard Depardieu got into Russia eventually, not Belgium, and Putin is quite happy to have him in there; they've only got a 13% tax there. It says...)

The amount of compensation to immigrants who voluntarily want to return home will be also reduced. If earlier the government paid 300 euros for every adult and 100 euros for every minor, in March of 2013 these amounts will be reduced to 50 and 30 euros, respectively.

One of the main provisions of the new immigration rules in France is the reduction of unemployment benefits. New rules will directly affect many of the immigrants who do not want to be of real assistance to the country and whose main goal is the existence at the expense of French taxpayers. Now immigrants who are EU citizens receive an allowance of 2,000 euros per adult and 1,000 euros per child.

Under the new policy, according to Valls, the payments will be reduced to 500 and 200 euros, respectively.

A: So they're making it less pleasant to come in and live on welfare, is basically what this article is talking about. But as I say, this is all part (and it's still all part) of the deconstruction process that was accepted by all the leaders of countries that signed on at the United Nations charter. And they said that they would destroy all predominant cultures in their countries, and using multiculturalism as well, and that's the main reason it's been happening. Plus, it benefits the bankers who end up running the country and it benefits the United Nations because they get involved in it in the World Bank, the Private World Bank gets involved in it too. It benefits all the big boys who run the world agenda (what's called the new world order) and of course it destroys the peoples who are still trying to hang on to their cultures, or a country, in the first place. They don't want countries anymore, you understand. They want them all reduced to basically little provinces under a world government. That's what it's down to.

From Hamish and myself, from Ontario Canada, it's goodnight and may your God, or your Gods, go with you.

Topics of show covered in following links:

[New Bank Liquidity Rules, Global](#)

["Global Regulators" in Basel Agree on New Bank Asset Rules](#)

[Cyborg Ads for Phone](#)

[& More on Above](#)

[CFR Unhappy with Mr. Hagel---"Mr. Hagel and the Jews"](#)

[Pro-Israel Group goes into Action Against Hagel](#)

[Obama Names Hagel and Brennan to Lead Pentagon and CIA](#)

[US Gun Proposals Too Extreme](#)

[CFR on Gun-Control](#)

["Green" Indoctrination in Scotland](#)

[Obama Admin. Allowed to Remain Silent over Drone Programme](#)

[India--Sterilization Safaris meet with Resistance](#)

[Migrants Flooding France](#)

Alan's Materials Available for Purchase and Ordering Information:

- [BOOKS](#)** "Cutting Through" & "Waiting for the Miracle....."
Volumes 1, 2, 3 Also available in Spanish or Portuguese translation:
"Esperando el Milagro....." ([Español](#)) & "Esperando
um Milagre....." ([Português](#))
- [CDs](#)** Ancient Religions
and History MP3
CDs: & Blurbs and 'Cutting Through the Matrix'
Part 1 (1998) and Shows on MP3 CDs (Up to 50 Hours per Disc)
Part 2 (1998-2000)
- [DVDs](#)** "Reality Check Part 1" & "Reality Check Part 2 - Wisdom,
Esoterica and ...TIME"